

# **CONSULTANT EVALUATION SYSTEM GENERAL CRITERIA CYCLE 21**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Consultant Evaluation System (CES) is an evaluation of a Consulting firm's past performance on NJDOT projects and an indication of a firm's capability to perform future projects for the Department. The System has been developed to objectively provide a "CES Score" that is used in the selection process of selecting a firm to perform work for the NJDOT. The CES Score, also referred to as the "Firm's Capability/Performance Score", is an evaluation criteria used in the review process of a Technical Proposal. The Consultant Evaluation System benefits both the Department and the Consultant by providing the Department with essential Consultant performance data and providing the Consultant with the opportunity to improve their job performance from one rating cycle to the next. The System is based on objective information, which is intended to lead to impartial ratings within the following five (5) "RATING DISCIPLINES":

- **DESIGN**
- **CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION**
- **ENVIRONMENTAL & ASBESTOS REMEDIATION**
- **STRUCTURAL EVALUATION**
- **PLANNING**

Within each RATING DISCIPLINE, the Consultant's performance may be rated in the following three (3) RATING CATEGORIES:

- **SCHEDULE**
- **QUALITY**
- **PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

The criteria for each of the three RATING CATEGORIES are specifically defined and weighted for each RATING DISCIPLINE and will be scored using the following rating score:

- 5 Outstanding**
- 4 Above Satisfactory**
- 3 Satisfactory**
- 2 Below Satisfactory**
- 1 Unacceptable**

HALF SCALE RATINGS WILL BE APPLIED WHERE DEEMED APPROPRIATE BY THE SPECIFIC UNIT PERFORMING THE CONSULTANT EVALUATION.

This scale is applied to each RATING CATEGORY, and along with certain category weights, will result in a numerical score for the agreement being evaluated. This single score along with the scores of the other agreements evaluated in the RATING DISCIPLINE are averaged together to produce the overall CES Score of the RATING DISCIPLINE. This overall CES Score is used in the consultant selection process during the review of technical proposals.

All consultant evaluations will be prepared by the agreements NJDOT Project Manager or Contract Manager.

## **RATING TYPES**

Each consultant agreement that is evaluated is defined by a specific RATING TYPE indicated on the CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT. This RATING TYPE is an indication of the progress or status of a project during a rating cycle. RATING TYPES may change from one rating cycle to the next and they are identified as follows.

**One Year:** All rating cycles are conducted yearly. A One-Year RATING TYPE is completed if an invoiced item of work is submitted during the rating cycle, such as submission of contract documents or completion of a task; it will be considered an item to be rated. However, if work was to be submitted by the Consultant but was not, it should be reflected in the rating with appropriate supporting documents. This type is noted as “**One-Year**” under the RATING TYPE on the CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT.

**Final:** The Final RATING TYPE is completed at the completion of a project or term agreement. It is noted as “**Final**” under the RATING TYPE on the CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT.

**NR (NOT REQUIRED):** The NR RATING TYPE is completed if an invoiced item of work or task has not occurred within the one-year rating cycle or if the Consultant has not performed sufficient work to complete a rating. The “**NR**” RATING TYPE is noted under the RATING TYPE on the CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT.

**Average:** This type of rating is only used on Term Agreements where multiple Task Orders within a Term Agreement are evaluated and averaged to develop a single rating for the Term Agreement. The “**Average**” RATING TYPE is noted under the RATING TYPE on the CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT.

## **RATING DISCIPLINES AND RATING CATEGORIES**

The Consultant Evaluation System comprises of five (5) RATING CATEGORIES (*Design, Construction Inspection, Environmental & Asbestos Remediation, Structural Evaluation, & Planning*) in which they are evaluated by three (3) RATING CATEGORIES (*Schedule, Quality, & Project Management*).

- **DESIGN**

The DESIGN RATING DISCIPLINE encompasses all preliminary & final design projects from the Division of Capital Program Management. This discipline also includes maintenance projects, emergency engineering and design engineering term agreements, and any design related agreements. For the DESIGN RATING DISCIPLINE only, three phases are evaluated during the course of a design project: Design Phase, Construction Phase, and Overall Quality.

Design Phase is the period for all one-year rating cycles during the Preliminary & Final Design Stages up to the Award of Project. The design phase rating percentages and criteria are applicable during this phase. During the *Design Phase*, the RATING CATEGORIES of Schedule, Quality, and Project Management are evaluated.

Construction Phase is the period for all one-year rating cycles after the Award of Project when the Department retains the Consultant to perform Construction Engineering Services. The Construction Phase rating percentages are applicable during this phase. The RATING CATEGORIES of Schedule, Quality, and Project Management are evaluated during the *Construction Phase*.

Overall Quality is measured upon the substantial completion of the project and the rating shall be performed under the criteria evaluating the constructability of the design. This category evaluates the completeness and quality of the Consultant's contract documents. Therefore, during this phase only the Quality RATING CATEGORY is evaluated.

### **CALCULATION OF A DESIGN-OVERALL QUALITY RATING**

***REFER TO THE APPENDIX FOR THE CALCULATION OF A FINAL OVERALL DESIGN QUALITY RATING***

- **CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION**

The CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION RATING DISCIPLINE includes all work done by the Consultant's Construction Inspection Engineering Staff to directly supervise, coordinate, inspect and/or measure all construction inspection work on a project. The CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION RATING DISCIPLINE is evaluated based upon the Quality and Project Management RATING CATEGORIES.

- **ENVIRONMENTAL & ASBESTOS REMEDIATION**

The ENVIRONMENTAL & ASBESTOS REMEDIATION RATING DISCIPLINE includes Term Agreements for and/or permitting (wetlands, cultural resources, hazardous waste, investigations, etc.) performed by a Consultant through a Term Agreement or Project Specific Agreement during Scope Development, Preliminary Design, Final Design, and Construction. The RATING DISCIPLINE also includes any Asbestos Remediation Agreements. For Environmental Agreements, the RATING CATEGORIES of Schedule, Quality, and Project Management are evaluated.

- **STRUCTURAL EVALUATION**

The STRUCTURAL EVALUATION RATING DISCIPLINE administers various bridge, culvert, and sign structures inspection programs and performs other procedures to ensure the structural safety and integrity of such structures along State and County roads. The RATING CATEGORIES of Schedule, Quality, and Project Management are evaluated in the STRUCTURAL EVALUATION RATING DISCIPLINE.

- **PLANNING**

The PLANNING RATING DISCIPLINE evaluates Concept Development, Feasibility/Needs Assessment, & Scope Development Agreements. This RATING DISCIPLINE also includes Bicycle/Pedestrian, Freight Planning, Local Roadway, Local Technical Assistance, Straight Line Diagrams, and Traffic Monitoring System Agreements. Schedule, Quality, and Project Management RATING CATEGORIES are evaluated in this DISCIPLINE.

**TABLE 1. CATEGORIES WEIGHTS PER DISCIPLINE**

The Consultant Evaluations will be based on the RATING CATEGORIES and weights as indicated below per each RATING DISCIPLINE.

RATING DISCIPLINE	RATING CATEGORIES		
	SCHEDULE (%)	QUALITY (%)	PROJECT MANAGEMENT (%)
Design – Design Phase	40	10	50
Design – Construction Phase	20	60	20
Design – Overall Quality	--	100	--
Construction Inspection	--	90	10
Environmental	20	60	20
Environmental Asbestos	--	90	10
Structural Evaluation	30	50	20
Planning	30	40	30

Prior to beginning work, the RATING CATEGORIES and forms will be discussed to assure understanding by all parties. The rating forms will include the applicable category weight percentages (totaling 100%). The applicable weight criteria indicated above will be used by all NJDOT contracting units and may not be modified.

## **FINAL RATINGS AND REVIEW**

Once the ratings have been completed for each Consultant, all CES Ratings are entered into the CONSULTANT EVALUATION SYSTEM CUMULATIVE REPORT and posted on the Professional Services web page. This report summarizes all CES Ratings per firm and per RATING DISCIPLINE, and is used to obtain a firm's CES Rating/Firm's Capability Score when reviewing technical proposals.

Also at the completion of CES Ratings, a letter and a copy of all the rated agreements are emailed to the Consultant for review. It is important that the Consultant maintains a "CES Contact" with Professional Services so that all CES correspondence can be forwarded to the proper Consultant contact. For any RATING DISCIPLINE score lower than satisfactory (3.0), the Consultant may request a debriefing within 10 days from the date of the rating letter/email. All debriefing requests should be directed to the Professional Services Procurement Division email [PSPD@dot.state.nj.us](mailto:PSPD@dot.state.nj.us). The CES Discipline in question should be included in the subject

line of the email. NJDOT Project Managers are not to be contacted directly. All Project Managers have been informed to direct all inquiries to Professional Services. Only written requests to Professional Services will be allowed. Any requests received after the 10 day deadline will not be accepted.

The Department's Contracting Unit's Director, the Project Manager (rater), and Project Manager's Supervisor, the Consultant Project Manager, Consultant Principal in Charge, and a representative from Professional Services will be required to attend the meeting, which will be arranged through Professional Services and held in the Professional Services Conference Room.

## **USE OF CONSULTANT EVALUATION SYSTEM RATINGS**

The Consultant Evaluation System Ratings was developed for the purpose of the Department for the Consultant selection process. The CES Ratings provides an objective indication of a firm's capability to perform professional services for the Department. When technical proposals for a project are being evaluated, each firm is given a Firm's Capability Score from the CES based upon the RATING DISCIPLINE of the specific solicitation. The Firm's Capability shall be measured as follows:

- If a firm **has a current NJDOT CES Rating** in the particular RATING DISCIPLINE of the solicitation, the firm's CES Rating for that RATING DISCIPLINE will be used.
- If a firm **has a current NJDOT CES Rating but not in the particular RATING DISCIPLINE** of the solicitation, the equivalent score will be used. However, the equivalent score will not exceed the industry average. If an equivalent score is below the industry average, the equivalent score will be used. If an equivalent score is above the industry average, the industry average is used.
- If a firm **does not have a current NJDOT CES Rating** in any of the RATING DISCIPLINES, the firm will receive the industry average. See the definitions for INDUSTRY AVERAGE.
- A **Joint Venture** will receive the average of each firm's CES Rating involved on the Joint Venture.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **CALCULATION OF A DESIGN – OVERALL QUALITY RATING**

#### **EQUATIONS FOR CALCULATING DESIGN-OVERALL QUALITY RATING**

The **Design-Overall Quality Rating**, which is the final rating of a design project, shall be a factor of the project's **Quality RATING CATEGORY Score** and the **project's "Total Weighted Rating" from the Rating Cycle**. The "**Total Weighted Rating**" is the CES Score of the project in the previous Rating Cycle. The final **Design-Overall Quality Rating** is calculated as shown:

$$(1) \quad \text{DESIGN-OVERALL QUALITY RATING} = \frac{\left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Cycle 20} \\ \text{Rating} \end{array} \right) + \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Cycle 21} \\ \text{Overall Quality Rating} \end{array} \times 3 \right)}{4}$$

**Cycle 20 Rating = Total Weighted Rating**

If there is an occurrence where the project was **not rated (NR)** during a particular Rating Cycle, the denominator of the above equation would be adjusted to accommodate for the missing NR cycle as follows:

$$(2) \quad \text{DESIGN-OVERALL QUALITY RATING} = \frac{\left( \begin{array}{c} \text{NR} \\ \text{(Cycle 20 Rating)} \end{array} \right) + \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Cycle 21} \\ \text{Overall Quality Rating} \end{array} \times 3 \right)}{3}$$

**Cycle Rating = Total Weighted Rating**

A Consultant's **Total Weighted Rating** will be determined as follows:

$$(3) \quad \text{TOTAL WEIGHTED RATING} = \text{Sum of WEIGHTED RATINGS}$$

$$\text{WEIGHTED RATINGS} = \text{CATEGORY RATING SCORE} \times \text{Weight Factor (\%)}$$

The CATEGORY RATING SCORES (the scores for ***Schedule, Quality, & Project Management***) will come from the CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT.

**A.** Example of a Design Project from start to finish **without a NR**

<b>Design Project</b>						
	Design Phase			Construction Phase		Overall Quality
	Cycle 16	Cycle 17	Cycle 18	Cycle 19	Cycle 20	Cycle 21
<b>Schedule</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	--
Weight Factor*	40%	40%	40%	20%	20%	--
Weighted Rating	1.20	1.60	2.00	0.60	1.00	--
<b>Quality</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
Weight Factor*	10%	10%	10%	60%	60%	100%
Weighted Rating	0.40	0.30	0.40	2.40	2.40	4.00
<b>Project Management</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	--
Weight Factor*	50%	50%	50%	20%	20%	--
Weighted Rating	2.50	2.50	1.50	0.80	1.00	--
<b>Total Weighted Rating</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>4.00</b>

\*Design Weight Factors

Using Equation (1) for projects **without a NR**,

$$\text{DESIGN-OVERALL QUALITY RATING} = \frac{(4.40) + (4.00 \times 3)}{4}$$

$$= \frac{4.40 + 12.0}{4}$$

$$\text{DESIGN-OVERALL QUALITY RATING} = \mathbf{4.10}$$

The DESIGN-OVERALL QUALITY RATING for this design project is **4.10**.



**B.**

Example of a Design Project from start to finish **with a NR**

<b>Design Project</b>						
	Design Phase			Construction Phase		Overall Quality
	Cycle 16	Cycle 17	Cycle 18	Cycle 19	Cycle 20	Cycle 21
<b>Schedule</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>NR</b>	--
Weight Factor*	40%	40%	40%	20%	--	--
Weighted Rating	1.20	1.60	2.00	0.60	--	--
<b>Quality</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>NR</b>	<b>4</b>
Weight Factor*	10%	10%	10%	60%	--	100%
Weighted Rating	0.40	0.30	0.40	2.40	--	4.00
<b>Project Management</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>NR</b>	--
Weight Factor*	50%	50%	50%	20%	--	--
Weighted Rating	2.50	2.50	1.50	0.80	--	--
<b>Total Weighted Rating</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>NR</b>	<b>4.00</b>

\* Design Weight Factors

Using Equation (2) for projects **with a NR**,

$$\text{DESIGN-OVERALL QUALITY RATING} = \frac{(\text{NR}) + (4.00 \times 3)}{3}$$

$$= \frac{\text{NR} + 12.0}{3}$$

$$\text{DESIGN-OVERALL QUALITY RATING} = \mathbf{4.00}$$

The DESIGN-OVERALL QUALITY RATING for this design project is **4.00**.

## **DEFINITIONS**

The following definitions are terms from the **CONSULTANT EVALUATION SYSTEM CUMULATIVE REPORT**.

**Consultant Evaluation System Cumulative Report** – the report that contains all of the final CES Ratings/Firm’s Capability Scores of all the Consultants in each of the five CATEGORY DISCIPLINES.

**Discipline Rating Average** – an average of all the “Total Weighted Category Rating” scores provided on the CONSULTANT EVALUATION REPORT of each firm’s agreements per RATING DISCIPLINE. The maximum or “perfect” Discipline Rating Average is 5.0.

**Discipline Rating Factor** – is the ratio of the Consultant Discipline Rating Average and the CES Discipline Averages.

$$\text{Design Rating Factor} = \frac{\text{Discipline Rating Average}}{\text{CES Discipline Averages}}$$

**Technical Proposal Rating Points** – is a proportion of the Discipline Rating Average to the maximum Discipline Rating Average (5.0) and the maximum Technical Proposal Rating Points (140). The maximum achievable Technical Proposal Rating score is 140 points.

$$\text{Technical Proposal Rating Points} = \left( \frac{\text{Discipline Rating Average}}{\text{max. Discipline Rating Average (5.0)}} \right) \times \left( \text{max. Technical Proposal Rating Points (140)} \right)$$

The maximum or “perfect” Technical Proposal Rating Points is 140.

**Rating Factor All Disciplines** – is the average of the Discipline Rating Factors.

**Equivalent Technical Proposal Rating Points** – is the score given to a Consulting Firm who doesn't have a rating score for a particular RATING DISCIPLINE but does have a score in another RATING DISCIPLINE. However, the equivalent score will not exceed the industry average. If an equivalent score is below the industry average, the equivalent score will be used. If an equivalent score is above the industry average, the industry average is used.

$$\text{Equivalent Technical Proposal Rating Points} = \frac{\text{Rating Factor}}{\text{All Disciplines}} \times \text{Industry Average}$$

**Industry Average** – is the average of each listed firm's TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RATING POINTS. An Industry Average rating score is only given if a firm does not have a CES Rating in any of the five RATING DISCIPLINES.